

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/539,201 | 09/20/2005 | Hiroshi Kawakabe | 07200/070001 | 2382 |
| 22511 OSHA LIANG | 7590 04/16/200 L.L.P. | 3 | EXAM | INER |
| 1221 MCKINN SUITE 2800 | | | SZEKELY, PETER A | |
| HOUSTON, TX | X 77010 | • | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1796 | |
| | | | | |
| | | • | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/16/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com buta@oshaliang.com

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | 10/539,201 | KAWAKABE ET AL. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| The MAN INC DATE of this communication and | Peter Szekely | 1796 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was realized to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MO cause the application to become A | ICATION. A reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Ju | <u>ıne 2005</u> . | | | | |
| , _ | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | • | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>17 June 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| • | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | v Summary (PTO-413) | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | | o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/17/05,9/20/05,12/8/06. | | | | | |

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/539,201

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b or a) as being anticipated by Wehner et al. 5,118,346, Sanyo Chem. Ind. Ltd. JP-11-092751, Cytec Technology Corp. WO 01/87900, Cytec Technology Corp. CA 2,343,456 or Sumitomo Dow Ltd. JP-173592.
- 3. See claims 1 and 5-7, column 1, lines 23-30, column 2, lines 17-54, column 3, lines 1-2, column 4, lines 59-66 and Examples 1, 2 and 18-20 of Wehner et al., the Abstract of Sanyo Chemical, claims 1-4 and 10 and Examples 13-16, 18 and 22-24 of Cytec ('900), page 29, lines17-18 of Cytec ('456) and the Abstract and pages 2-4 (English translation) of Sumitomo Dow Ltd. Applicants' claims are not novel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Application/Control Number: 10/539,201

Art Unit: 1796

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 6. Claim 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wehner et al. 5,118,346, Sanyo Chem. Ind. Ltd. JP-11-092751, Cytec Technology Corp. WO 01/87900, Cytec Technology Corp. CA 2,343,456 or Sumitomo Dow Ltd. JP-173592, in view of Patel e al. 6,528,572.
- 7. The primary references have been discussed already. Patel et al. disclose conductive carbon nanotubes in a polymer composition which contains an antistatic agent. It would have been obvious to add the carbon nanotubes to the composition of the primary references, since conductive filler enhances the antistatic effect. It is well settled that it is a matter of obviousness for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine two or more materials when each is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose. In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (571) 272-1124. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:10 a.m.-4:40 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

Art Unit: 1796

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peter Szěkely Primary Examiner Art Unit 1796

P.S. 1/17/08